REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed on March 14, 2003, claims 18 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Baker; claims 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Elabd; claims 1, 4, 6 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elabd in view of Baker; claims 3, 5, 8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elabd in view of Baker and Yanai; claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker in view of Elabd; and claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker in view of Yanai. Newly added claims 25-28 are patentable over the cited art. The §§ 102 and 103 rejections are discussed below.

Rejections of Claims 1-5:

As amended, the imager of independent claim 1 includes, for each pixel sensor, at least two storage locations that are located in a pixel array to store indications from the pixel sensor. Claim 1 recites that each storage location is designated for a different one of the primary color components of the image. The imager of claim 1 includes circuitry to, for each pixel sensor, during a first integration interval, couple the pixel sensor to one of the associated storage locations and during a second integration interval, couple the pixel sensor to another one of the storage locations.

The Examiner rejects independent claim 1 under § 103 in view of Elabd and Baker. Although Baker discloses two capacitors for each detector element, there is no suggestion or motivation in the prior art to modify Baker so that each one of these capacitors 2 is somehow designated for a particular primary color component. In this manner, Elabd does not supply the necessary suggestion or motivation, as Elabd discusses an arrangement in which color exposures are delivered, "one exposure at a time, to light-shielded memory sites or storage registers 454." Elabd, 4:10-12. More particularly, Elabd is directed to dedicated color storage locations after integration occurs. Therefore, even assuming the combination of Baker and Elabd is proper, this combination does not produce an imager in which each pixel sensor uses two capacitors for integration, and each capacitor is designated for a specific primary color. Thus, there is no suggestion or motivation in either Baker or Elabd to modify the arrangement disclosed in Baker

so that each capacitor 2 is somehow associated with a particular primary color component so that this capacitor 2 integrates color for the designated color component.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be a suggestion or motivation in the art to modify a reference to derive a missing claim limitation. Such a suggestion or motivation to modify Baker to derive the missing claim limitations has not been set forth in the Office Action. Thus, it is submitted that, as amended, claim 1 overcomes the § 103 in view of Baker and Elabd.

Claims 2-5 are patentable for at least the reason that these claims depend from an allowable claim.

Rejections of Claims 6-10:

As amended, the camera of claim 6 includes at least two storage locations for each pixel sensor. The camera also includes circuitry to for each pixel sensor, during a first integration interval, couple the pixel sensor to one of the storage locations and during a second integration interval, couple the pixel sensor to another one of the storage locations. As amended, claim 6 further recites that each storage location is designated for a different primary color component.

See discussion of claim 1 above. In particular, there is no suggestion or motivation in either Elabd or Baker to modify the arrangement of Baker so that each capacitor 2 is designated for a particular primary color component. Therefore, for at least this reason, claim 6 overcomes the § 103 rejection based on the combination of Baker and Elabd.

Claims 7-10 are patentable for at least the reason that these claims depend from an allowable claim.

Rejections of Claims 11-17:

The method of claim 11 recites during a first integration interval, storing an indication of a first primary color component of an image in a pixel sensor array; and during a second integration interval, storing an indication of a second primary color component of the image in the array. Claim 11 also recites that the second primary color component is different from the first primary color component.

The Examiner rejects independent claim 11 under § 103 in view of Elabd and Baker. However, neither Elabd nor Baker contains the requisite suggestion or motivation to modify

Baker so that different color components are stored in the pixel sensor array. More specifically, Baker is silent regarding primary color components. Furthermore, Elabd teaches delivering the color exposures from the sensor device 450 to the image register 452. See, for example, Elabd, 4:5-22. However, Elabd neither teaches nor suggests storing more than one primary color component value in image register 452, and therefore, Elabd neither teaches nor suggests storing more than one primary color component indication in a pixel sensor array. Thus, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been set forth for independent claim 11 for at least the reason that the combination of Elabd and Baker fails to teach or suggest all claim limitations.

Claims 12-17 are patentable for at least the reason that these claims depend from an allowable claim.

Rejections of Claims 18-21:

The method of claim 18 recites providing a pixel sensor and providing at least two storage locations that are associated with the pixel sensor. As amended, claim 18 recites that each of the storage locations is associated with a different primary color component.

Baker neither teaches nor suggests that each capacitor 2 is associated with a particular primary color component. Therefore, for at least this reason, Baker fails to disclose all limitations of claim 18. Thus, withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of claim 18 is requested.

Claims 20 and 21 are patentable for at least the reason that these claims depend from an allowable claim.

Rejections of Claims 22-24:

As amended, the imager of claim 22 includes an array of pixel sensors and at least two integration devices for each pixel sensor. Claim 22 recites that each integration device is designated to provide a value for a different primary color.

Elabd neither teaches nor suggests integration devices that are each associated with a different primary color. Instead, Elabd teaches delivering exposures from a sensor device 450 to an image register 454 and then associating particular locations with color values. Elabd, however, neither teaches nor suggests integration devices where integration device is designated to provide a value for a different primary color. Therefore, for at least this reason, Elabd fails to teach the limitations of amended claim 22.

Claims 23 and 24 are patentable for at least the reason that these claims depend from an allowable claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the §§ 102 and 103 rejections and a favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance are requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (ITL.0061US).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/16/03

Fred G. Pruner, Jr. Reg. No. 40,779
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]